

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on March 29, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Additionally attached to this Amendment is a Petition for a Two-month Extension of Time, extending the period for response to August 29, 2006. Also attached hereto is a Request for Continued Examination to ensure entry of the claim amendments.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claim 12 to include the subject matter of claims 14 and 17. Further, claims 14 and 17 have been canceled, and claim 19 has been added to the application. Claims 12, 18 and 19 are the independent claims, and claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12-16 as being anticipated by *Matsukawa* (JP 404023327). Because independent claim 12 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 17, which claim was not rejected as being anticipated by this reference, this rejection has been rendered moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 12, 13 and 17 as being anticipated by *Park et al.* (USP 6,469,392). Because independent claim 12 has been amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 14, which claim was not rejected as being anticipated by this reference, this rejection has been rendered moot.

Moreover, it is believed that independent claim 12, as well as newly added claim 19, are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the first lower part and the second upper part have a first constant width and that the second lower part and the first upper part have a second constant width. The Examiner's Action had relied on the teaching of *Matsukawa* as disclosing this feature. However, it is noted that the Figure 4 of this reference shows that the vertical legs of the interconnecting lines 2, 3, appear to bulge outwardly when they enter the dielectric layer 14. Thus, this portion of the interconnecting line does not appear to have a constant width.

Moreover, claim 12 recites that the interconnecting lines have a first height, with the first upper part, the second upper part, the first lower part, and the second lower part having a second height equal to half the first height. As shown in Figure 4 of *Matsukawa*, the vertical legs of the interconnecting lines 2, 3 have a height which is substantially larger than a height of the horizontal legs.

Moreover, the Examiner's Action had also relied on the teachings of *Park et al.* However, this reference also does not disclose interconnecting lines having upper and lower parts having constant width. Moreover, these interconnecting lines are triangular shaped. The Action holds that these interconnecting lines can be arbitrarily divided. However, there is no teaching from this reference of dividing these interconnecting lines into upper and lower parts, much less dividing them into upper and lower parts in which the respective parts have a height that is equal to one-half the total height of the interconnecting line. Moreover, and as noted above, since this reference does not disclose interconnecting lines having upper and lower parts having respective constant widths, then this reference can not possibly disclose or suggest such parts having the heights required by Applicant's

independent claim 12. It is thus requested, that this claim, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, be allowed.

Moreover, newly added independent claim 19 is submitted to be patentably distinguishable over the references for similar reasons to those presented above with respect to independent claim 12. It is likewise requested that this claim be allowed.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should the remittance be accidentally missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Registration No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Customer No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Fax: 202-408-0924

August 25, 2006
Date

RHB/vm